

Who?

A Markeyami?

Evidence for climate is far greater than for
new winter.

Evidence for new winter much less (though good.)

Chair Board on climate models.

But if evidence on climate

Technical evidence on new winter is depress.

~~Without~~ nothing — from me.

Drifts off to

The weapons ~~already~~ ^{against} cannot be adapted
with the present plans

25 years ago, we could have changed:

~~to~~ NFTU, ... not signed.

If you don't care about 60% arms

for 1 (1991') — a nuclear form is to be prevented.

Expansion of NATO — to keep areas out of Russia —
present German - Russian axis.

// lost cars, more preserving identity than losing a
part of global destination.

Real objective of CW was: preventing the SU alliance from affecting the rest of the world.
(Not SU itself).

Now — preventing their even influence in rest of the world — is even more important

1973-79 — Striking VN, oil embargo, rest. of oil assets in M.E. in '70's (AEROMACOS...)

The role of the corp. establishment to have a more thorough global exploitation — inc. in US (Carter has helped
P Koch Bros., control of US politics)

Central non AC people have been migrated to the East can be forwarded to do:

(other, expansion of NATO, putting ABM Treaty
FV/FS
profits of Boeing

[Why no

Alliance Russians — call down them to allow to buy as it is in NATO — also undermine European Union
Gulf War + Iraq bombing in '98: Prevent Euro from replacing dollar as global currency.

1973 — US abandons Bretton Woods, US \$35

Why didn't anyone abandon dollar in 1973?

No alternative; Ft. Knox in Saudi Arabia + thousands of billions, + more of them, will not panic come up.

When an alternative appeared (in 1990's, plan for Euros, ECU - 1990 Euro Currency Union — if Europe became a political entity — a real will begin leaving the US...

In 70s-80s, US prints money. In 90s
they devalue.

An import-based economy (Japan)
dollar tends to cost more imports

In 80s US incurs a huge balance of credit deficits — further add debt, but money in US banks

US de-industrializes, TN begin to industrialize
Margin between cost of production & price of sales increases (huge expenses for advertising — R&D — travel for sales)

Euros cannot be allowed to be alternative.

Print oil price denominated in Euros.

Print big OPEC contracts from majority to Euros.

AMaka

2-2-15

at end of 70's, US didn't have a global military presence in 180's

- physical control of oil (to be a ~~key factor~~ number of OPEC)

Physical occupation of Kuwait; in Saudi-Arabia (until OBL); - Iraq (not from)

to keep it from switching to Iran.

as SH was telling — and Iran. (Khomeiny?)

(US ~~helping~~ SH — by went from

AM thinks in ME we asked SH to bomb ~~Iran~~ for not same Iraq to Med — go around Persian Gulf

In May 80's a rift with SH — goal of destroying ~~Iraq~~ not achieved (original cause goal since 1979)
US welcome /

Iraq War — 2 axis — occupation (as a factor

— what was it about and? number of OPEC

to control flow? NO

- Oil corps don't control resources — profit to states.

Occupation of Kuwait & Iraq — to prevent IS and

(Hostility of Iraqi public too high)

Brown weighted — depleted goals
of never in or never — ambiguous
Lamis, from JC to Libya/Dra

In 2002, last report says it can't
control because of internal

of Libya

Now, Euro is less of a threat
(& creation of unity...
could have evolved into a superstate-centred Const.
broader than Euro.)

Americans are not as oil-centred in their foreign
policy as before

(more)

W_G does US

Post-bronze policy: Rebuilding state
in US and R.

(there has been some age-related safety
or reliability problem)

(AM and FOIA regime to Los Alamos).

In 80's, Reagan opposed a ^{natural} gas pipeline
from R.

ATB - Long Gamma ray - in 2002 prints:

on Sanitarium Mountain:

Boring tunnels, + off trees - He was surprised
mount fell apart after ATB.

Ran there more than extraction - Now, can't big Christ hole

AN - join FV/Fs to

Kuene 1951 first test in Nevada -

Rosie bin got passed (com products in
Kore tanks to me - ~~soybeans~~)

USC does nothing to protect milk supply

USC does print advanced warning of tests

Nevada, daughter - why will anyone want to
test? what you want to write?

Mossey Can't these USC to protect you

One book

PACOM

+ Defense

Aug 2002

No comment. Really, information

How Many Will Die?

The Strangelovian "documentary"
aspect

p. 12 re: firestorms: Would be useful to point out
that:

- There were firestorms in Hiroshima (& Nagasaki, I think)
- Hiroshima & Nagasaki were, in fact, nuclear tests
and are officially classified as such. So
the effects of the bombings including the firestorms
were probably well understood then.

There are probably declassified documents
that would help here.

p. 14 Is the Kennedy back channel negotiation with
Khrushchev in Oct 1962 a partial &
temporary exception?

re: para "Eisenhower had chosen to accept these risks..."

p. 15

There is a brief history of the origin & theory
of air warfare on IER's web site.

ieer.org/resource/other/strategic-bombing
that you may find useful.

963-
964-

763c
x 2 10

②

Iwakuni I : 1960

PP 1-3

The "offensive defense" documents regarding
bases that I sent you
base & basing strategy that
I sent you may be useful here.

Question: in PACOM chapter you relate
that nuclear weapons were present with &
part of war plans at Kadena AFB.

How could the Japanese not know? Weren't
there any Japanese on the base?

No Japanese intelligence gathering?

It more than strains credulity that they
were not aware of the role that Japanese
bases would play in a nuclear war.

C p. 8 Great point re: the Maine

The Pao-tung Command War Plan.

p. 3. The Sino-Soviet split & the role of nuclear weapons in it is little known or understood. I hope you'll say some more about it.

Also, the split resulted in the withdrawal of Soviet technical personnel & (so far as I understand) triggered the "Great Leap Forward" - including huge efforts at small scale uranium mining for China's bomb program

- with all the disastrous consequences for China's people of that "Great Leap"

of course you know better than me the connection of those events with the 1954 & 1959 Quemoy/Matsu crisis & US Nuclear threats.

Connecting these dots even briefly here would be very useful.

pp. 12-13 I think the WWI analogy
re: mobilization is fallacious.

The whole mind-set being against first
a US-Soviet war is new to me.

Briefing Boundary

~~p. 2 last line "Secretary Cato"?~~

It might be of interest to note here, or
someplace else in the description of
nuclear war plans that no coherent view
existed of the number of warheads & bombs
the US needed.

In testimony in the 1950's (I think - I can send
you the reference) one General said the
Army needed 150,000 bombs (from memory)
for tactical use!

Of course LeMay & SAC had their famous
1956 plan to "convert the Soviet Union
into a smoking radioactive ruin" with 750 bombs

Delegation II

p. 3 I did not understand this sentence:

"To the extent that ~~delegote~~ devolution and survival . . . delegation wouldn't be necessary."

→ p. 5 Camp David is in Maryland.
in the Catoctin mountains.
Please note

(1)

p. 1 3(a) Cold War has 2 periods pre Cuban
missile crisis & post today Re deliberate large scale
nuclear war, risk "may be greater than
post-1962 crisis". Russia & U.S. both in
decline - a new circumstance of confrontation

{

3(b) Speculation on percentage probabilities is
not useful, in my opinion
3(c) is ~~not~~ good. Does not need 3(b).

3(d) Agree re: two doomsday machines on
hair-trigger.

3(d) - 2nd comment. Is it US v. Russia or
as during 1962 crisis the military/nuclear
establishments of both on one side, increasing risks?

{
3(e) 3(h) (i) Agree re: nuclear winter but this is
a hard sell to those not involved, given that
even a climate crisis that is ~~not~~ already here is
not sufficiently persuasive for unified political
mobilization. So how much play to give nuclear
winter? -
Russia

{

- Also not new, a not something you are
bringing to the table

→ One question should be added to your list:
What why does the public want to pay attention to
what you say? Or: what is special
about you that can move public discussion/opinion?

(2)

{ 3(j) Is monetizability and legality ~~an~~ a central point?

| 3(k) The 1959 reference is infringing & could be more important than the known 1968 Nixon reference

?

{ 3(n) I agree. This is clear & derived from your earlier points. But if a pre-emptive strike is the aim of US posture, then wouldn't the US want the Russians to get rid of their submarine force first?

?

3(r) ~~I don't think~~ I am very skeptical that the Fissile Materials cut off treaty would be beneficial. It could have the perverse effect of encouraging civilian plutonium separation.

Generally on 3 conclusions 3(n) to 3(r)

This is a very conventional arms control / disarmament agenda apart from 3(n) - long range land based arm of the triad.

~~Also~~ It implies that nuclear disarmament is great progress to it & abandonment

(3)

?

of first strike posture can be achieved under the present world economic/political/military structure.

→ I think it cannot.

There is every evidence that the powers that be are willing to risk extinction to maintain their power — & nuclear weapons posture is EXHIBIT A in that.

So you support evidence that

Indeed you provide evidence that the establishment knows that extinction or near extinction of humanity could be the result:

So what would persuade them to now view that prospect with enough alarm that they ~~would~~ would change nuclear posture to your proposed 3(p)?

✓
-NFD

X 6(a)(b) Is it needed? Given recent NOAA participation in the paper on limited nuclear war?

6(i) Don't dilute the 100% to 90% or
link to nuclear winter. Besides even 10% of US arsenal larger than India or Pakistan

SCBMS

10

ii

6(k) I agree w: no first use of course but this requires a prior US posture change of a fundamental nature — much more than giving up land based missiles.

Nuclear posture change of a fundamental nature is linked to a basic change in US view of its role in the world. That is a or perhaps the critical problem.

v { 6(n) What is "minimum deterrence" for countries with ~100 nuclear bombs or warheads?

? | 6(p) I think a demand that NW convention negotiators begin now ~~is~~ risks getting a bad treaty at best. Not a good course at the moment in terms of priorities.
6(r) is more to the point.

6(q) Won't dropping of nuclear umbrella for Japan lead to a Japanese nuclear arsenal? ~~I think~~
If done in the near future,
I think it likely.

bottom of 13 → your argument looks down &
a hope "...if Ukraine simmers down..."

Reestablishment of US-Russian détente is
contrary to the central direction of US
politics in that arena since 1990 →
expansion of NATO, dropping the ABM Treaty,
going to war in Iraq (starting w/ 1998
bombing campaign, then again 2003) without
Security Council authorization

?
What are the global conditions that
could possibly lead to its reestablishment?

~~With~~ Indeed if low oil prices persist,
the prospect is grim for such a
détente because the Russians view it as
part of US policy to squeeze them
(whether it's true or not is another question)

bottom of 13-14 → India Pakistan --
"chimerical" — I agree.

(8) ~~I~~ I think your linking your
central argument ~~is~~ to nuclear winters
a mistake. It's not the area in
which the public looks to your judgment.

p.16

"So long as US and Russian nuclear arsenals remain at or near present levels and posture..."

I think the "posture" part is much more important than the "levels" part

Also I think dismissing de-alerting

"dates ... de-alerted or not"

is wrong. De-alerting with

~~Def-alerted completely (minimum days or weeks to launch) would require a different posture so~~

~~reconstitution~~ ^{time} in weeks or longer would allow progress on all 3 ~~most~~ points listed below that.

p.17
top

I think the idea that we could all die in a nuclear catastrophe is too abstract. I'll send you my 2002 interview with Barry Commoner.

p.17 bottom ".about half that time our leaders were unaware of it."

THIS IS
HUGE
but buried

#

p. 18

I would say that the climate prognosis is far more reliable and has far more evidence than nuclear winter - which has good evidence, but unfortunately still indirect (volcanoes and fires, and such) for the most part + some from atmospheric testing.

So the question is if the huge and mounting real world evidence on climate is not enough for concerted action at a level corresponding to the crisis - & we are in the midst of it - why would a theory of nuclear winter, no matter how cogent be persuasive enough.

This is NOT to say that it should not be part of the argument but it is to say that

1) ~~It's~~ You should reconsider its credibility to your book

2) You should look at what has worked. Three things:

1) Fall out ~~of~~ → atmospheric fallout

2) MIRVs → ABM treaty

3) 1991 Threat from loose

nukes → tactical weapons

with drawdown & dismantlement

FO, first + FS

6(s) Delegitimizing nuclear weapons

should be a central goal - but not as a response from the bureaucracy, ~~which is the~~ but from the public

6 as a response from the bureaucracy or the political realm is really two pieces - ① bureaucracy
② public. They are very different

The main thing the public needs to grasp is the reality of US nuclear policy & what it has wrought in terms of the danger to the US public.

{ Nuclear winter & all that has little potential to persuade ^{in the US} no matter how dire & correct the analysis might be

T: The most important point here is the historical example of the unilateral withdrawal & dismantlement of almost all "factical" weapons in 1991. It was for US safety.

? Similarly, getting rid of land based missiles for US safety

7 → I think (but am not sure) that "refurbishment" applies to SLBM warheads too.

The argument against refurbishment is weaker — not need for safety & not needed if first strike is not a goal.

Agree w: Campaign against pre-emption — but what should be its content?

It seems to me that the reality of the specific nuclear threats (Iran, Iraq, Guatemala, Vietnam, Korea, etc.)

is lost in the strategic argumentation.

If at least in this write up, the connection is missing in para 3, 6, 7, 8.

p. 13 : So why did the "rationally compelling" logic for NFU 25 years ago not get implemented?

You don't address this. It's central to understanding why the fear of near-extinction is not persuasive enough to lead to disarmament or even NFU.

dr Klenk W

AM: mention

GHWB cutting off
tac weapons

1991

(and at of Korean brought
the to the table -)

2 AM's in decline -

a pathological

trie — obvious

Potini — but for

us, too.

get rid of ICBMs

the Bush found the
was in Europe (7000)

AH

[] Don't need to do
PP twice. (done)

US has had a FS
policy.

Provocation
(as in silly frontier -
and in a few others...)

"We're the good guys"
but FC has now been
permitted to US public

not about
how my will die
by know that - (?)

This is Ammin policy
bad guys are here

Ammin people
should know



Kitty - ^{8/6/1} crazy.

everybody went
back on Moscow

People took moral
agents one opposed
to socialist ones —
if you're making
a moral agent
it's because you
don't have a
moralistic agent